

Keywords: Solid-phase cytometry, airborne microorganisms, bioaerosol

Detection and quantification of viable, airborne bacteria and fungi using solid-phase cytometry

Lies M. E. Vanhee, Hans J. Nelis & Tom Coenye

Laboratory of Pharmaceutical Microbiology, Ghent University, Harelbekestraat 72, B-9000, Ghent, Belgium. Correspondence should be addressed to L.M.E.V. (lies.vanhee@ugent.be), H.J.N. (hans.nelis@ugent.be) or T.C. (tom.coenye@ugent.be).

Corresponding author:

Tom Coenye

Laboratory of Pharmaceutical Microbiology

Ghent University

B-9000 Ghent

Belgium

Tel.: +32 9 2648141

Fax: +32 9 2648195

Email: Tom.Coenye@UGent.be

1 **SUMMARY**

2 This protocol describes the use of solid-phase cytometry for the enumeration of
3 airborne bacteria and fungi. In contrast with conventional methods, accurate results
4 can be obtained in real time especially for air samples with low numbers of
5 microorganisms. Air samples are collected by impaction on a water-soluble polymer
6 that is subsequently dissolved. Part of the sample can be filtered over two membrane
7 filters with different pore sizes. One filter is used to obtain a total count of all viable
8 microorganisms, and a second filter is used to determine the number of airborne
9 fungi. Microorganisms present on the filter are labelled with a viability substrate and
10 subsequently detected and quantified using a solid-phase cytometer. The detected
11 spots are microscopically validated using an epifluorescence microscope to
12 discriminate between bacteria, fungi and fluorescent particles. The whole procedure
13 takes 5 hours to complete and results in the accurate quantification of airborne
14 bacteria and fungi for samples with a low or high microbial load.

INTRODUCTION

In solid-phase cytometry (SPC), the principles of epifluorescence microscopy and flow cytometry are combined¹. Microorganisms are retained on a membrane filter, fluorescently labelled and automatically counted by the Chemsan RDI laser-scanning device. Subsequently, the data for each fluorescent spot are analysed by a computer to differentiate between fluorescent microorganisms and particles. Each retained spot can visually be inspected using an epifluorescence microscope^{1,2}. Due to its high dynamic range and speed, SPC seems to solve the shortcomings observed with other methods for quantification of airborne microorganisms. Theoretically, this method would be perfect to enumerate microorganisms in air samples with a very low microbial load.

Overview of SPC

A schematic presentation of the different steps of a SPC protocol is shown in **Figure 1**. First, samples are filtered over a black polyester or polycarbonate membrane filter with an appropriate pore size. These screen filters are used because of their low background fluorescence and the high contrast which facilitates validation using the epifluorescence microscope. Second, the retained cells are fluorescently stained using one or more physiological or taxonomic probes³. Cleavage of carboxyfluorescein diacetate (ChemChrome V6) by microbial esterases results in the formation of fluorescent carboxyfluorescein in intact and metabolically active cells only and fluorescently labelled antibodies or oligonucleotide probes target specific microorganisms independent of their physiological state³.

Next, the fluorescence emitted by the labelled cells is detected using a solid-phase cytometer, which consists of an argon laser, emitting light of 488 nm for

fluorophore excitation and two photomultiplier tubes for signal detection. The produced signals are processed by a computer to differentiate valid signals (labelled microorganisms) from fluorescent particles. To this end, data for several software parameters such as the size of the fluorescent spot, the specific intensity, the color ratio and the signal pattern are used (**Fig. 2**). Results are displayed as green spots on a membrane filter image in a primary and, after software elimination of background spots, displayed as a secondary scan map².

Last, to further analyse the properties of the retained spots (positioned with x and y coordinates), particles on the membrane are visually inspected using an epifluorescence microscope equipped with a computer-driven moving stage. Highlighting of a green spot in the secondary scan map directs the microscope to the respective position on the membrane filter, allowing rapid and accurate validation.

Applications of SPC

SPC has most frequently been used for the detection of highly diluted microorganisms in water:

- Determination of the total viable count (TVC) using the viability stain ChemChrome V6^{1, 4, 5, 6}.
- Total viable fungal count by combining viability labelling and lectin labelling⁷.
- Specific enumeration of *Escherichia coli* by using a fluorogenic substrate for the target-specific enzyme β -glucuronidase⁸.
- Specific detection of *E. coli* O157:H7⁹, *Cryptosporidium parvum* and *Giardia lamblia*^{10, 11}, *Legionella pneumophila*¹², *Naegleria fowleri*¹³, and the toxic

64 alga *Prymnesium parvum* ¹⁴ by combining SPC with immunofluorescence
65 labelling.

- 66 • Specific detection of *Enterobacteriaceae* sp.¹⁵, *E. coli* ¹⁶ and *P. parvum* ¹⁷
67 fluorescently labelled by fluorescence *in situ* hybridization.
- 68 • Detection of *Campylobacter jejuni* using viability staining ¹⁸.

69 SPC has also been used for detection of microorganisms in air samples:

- 70 • Enumeration of bacteria and fungi ¹⁹.
- 71 • Specific detection of *Aspergillus fumigatus* in air samples (L.M.E.V., H.J.N.
72 and T.C., submitted).

73 And SPC has been used for detection of fungi in clinical samples:

- 74 • Specific detection of *A. fumigatus* in bronchoalveolar lavage liquid and
75 sputum by combining viability staining and immunofluorescence labelling ²⁰,
76 ²¹.
- 77 • Specific detection of *Cryptococcus neoformans* in serum and cerebrospinal
78 fluid by combining viability staining and immunofluorescence labeling ²².

79

80 **Advantages and limitations of SPC**

81 One of the important advantages of SPC is its speed and ability to enumerate
82 rare events. As this method does not rely on culturing the microorganisms,
83 quantification results for both culturable and nonculturable, viable microorganisms
84 can be obtained within a few hours. Additionally, the filter membrane is scanned by
85 the laser in only three minutes ^{1, 2, 3}.

86 SPC has a theoretical detection limit of one cell per filtered volume ^{1, 2}, but
87 SPC can also be used to determine the microbial load of highly contaminated samples

as it has a high dynamic range with an upper limit of approximately 10,000 cells per membrane filter⁶.

The applicability of SPC is often restricted by the ability to filter the sample. Previously, intensive procedures had been necessary to obtain a modest improvement in the ability to filter bronchoalveolar lavage and sputum samples²¹. In the present protocol, a filterable air sample is created by impacting a defined volume of air on a water-soluble polymer that is subsequently dissolved¹⁹.

In some samples, the occurrence of fluorescent particles may lead to an aborted scan or to a cumbersome validation when numerous spots are present in the secondary window. By implementing a counterstaining step and/or using a filter with a larger pore size, this problem can sometimes be overcome²³.

Alternatives to SPC for the quantification of airborne microorganisms

Conventional enumeration of airborne microorganisms relies on culture-based or microscopic methods. Culture-based analysis often results in an underestimation of the number of microorganisms owing to the quantification of culturable microorganisms only and differences in growth requirements between microorganisms. Additionally, analysis usually takes at least three days to complete, and fast-growing microorganisms may overgrow slow-growing ones²⁴.

In contrast, microscopic methods allow the detection of both culturable and nonculturable airborne microorganisms, and results can be obtained within hours of sample collection. However, microscopic enumeration is laborious, requiring a high level of expertise²⁴ and less sensitive than SPC^{1, 25}.

Recently flow cytometry (FC)^{25, 26}, PCR²⁷ and different biochemical assays targeting, for example, β ,1-3-D-glucan²⁸, ergosterol²⁹ and ATP³⁰, have been

suggested as alternative strategies for the quantification of airborne bacteria and fungi. FC proved to be more precise and reliable than epifluorescence microscopy but it suffered from a relatively high detection limit (10^3 cells/ml). In addition, high background fluorescence was observed for several samples. In contrast, SPC has a theoretical detection limit of one cell per filter. Additionally, the implementation of a counterstaining procedure and visual validation by epifluorescence microscopy allows to easily make the distinction between particles and microorganisms using SPC. Although PCR is a widely used procedure to quantify both viable and non-viable microorganisms, additional reamplification and hybridization steps were necessary to obtain a detection limit of 10 cells when applied to air samples leading to a 9 h procedure. Compared to this method, SPC is much faster and only quantifies the viable cells. Finally, a number of biochemical assays have been developed. However, the applicability of some of these assays is limited (e.g. β ,1-3-D-glucan and ergosterol can be used only for fungi) and it is often difficult or impossible to correlate the results obtained with cell numbers.

EXPERIMENTAL DESIGN

This protocol describes the use of solid-phase cytometry to enumerate viable, airborne microorganisms. Therefore, air is impacted on a water-soluble polymer film present in a standard Petri dish (PVA plate). After dissolution, a measured volume of the obtained suspension can be filtered and viable cells are labelled using a viability stain. Subsequently, the filter is laser scanned and a computer discriminates fluorescent particles from microorganisms using several software parameters. Finally, the retained spots are microscopically validated. A flow diagram of the procedure is presented in **Figure 3**.

138

139 **Preparation of PVA plates**

140 **1** Prepare a 10% (wt/vol) solution of PVA in ultrapure water.

141 **CRITICAL STEP** Make sure that the PVA is completely dissolved. Place the
142 solution on a magnetic stirring plate for at least 15 min.

143

144 **2** Filter the obtained solution through a 0.22 µm pore size filter/storage bottle system.

145

146 **3** Pour 15 ml of the sterilized solution into a 90 mm Petri dish.

147

148 **4** Leave the Petri dish opened in a vertical laminar flow cabinet for 11 hours.

149 **CRITICAL STEP** Make sure to respect the timing as plates which are overdried
150 result in the difficult capture of microorganisms during air sampling due to bouncing
151 on the hard surface. Underdried PVA films, on the other hand, are difficult to remove
152 from the Petri dish. It is not necessary to dry for 11 consecutive hours.

153 **PAUSE POINT** PVA plates (sealed with parafilm) can be stored for 1 month at 4 °C.

154 **TROUBLESHOOTING**

155

156 **Solid phase cytometer**

157 A solid phase cytometer consists of an argon laser and two photomultiplier
158 tubes. Up till now the only solid phase cytometer commercially available is
159 manufactured by AES-Chemunex and is called the ChemScan *RDI*. After the filter is
160 scanned, the fluorescent spots detected by the photomultiplier tubes are displayed on a
161 primary scan map. Afterwards, the computer analyses the data to discriminate
162 between fluorescent particles and microorganisms and displays the retained spots in a

secondary scan map. The size of the fluorescent spot is reflected in the values for lines (the number of laser lines where the spot is found) and samples (the number of laser spots on the same line where the spot is found). A second important characteristic of a fluorescent spot is the fluorescence intensity which is higher in relation to its size for a microorganisms than for a particle. A third discriminant is the area (color) ratio which refers to the fluorescence intensity found for green and red signals. A microorganism usually has a low red fluorescence intensity. Finally, the pattern of the signal resembles a Gaussian curve for a microorganism while a more irregular pattern is observed for a particle (**Fig. 2**).

Depending of the application used to perform the computer discrimination, different minimum and maximum values are set for the software discriminants. Two applications, incorporated in the AES-Chemunex software, are used in this protocol. The discriminant settings for both applications are shown in **Table 1**.

Control procedures

From each batch of PVA plates, three unexposed plates were tested for sterility using the total viable count procedure. Only these batches for which sterility was confirmed were used in further experiments.

Before initiation, a control procedure is required to confirm system functionality, laser beam focus, membrane support stage position and detection sensitivity. To this end, filter 100 µl of Standard C3 latex fluorescent beads as five discrete spots through a 0.4 µm Cycloblack-coated polyester membrane filter and initiate a scan using the 'control membrane' application. Check whether the mean peak intensity is within the acceptance range and whether beads are detected in all five

187 spots. Additionally, set the offsets for the moving stage by scanning the reference
188 membrane and manually positioning the center in the microscope objective.

189 **MATERIALS**

190 **REAGENTS**

191 • Poly(vinyl alcohol) (PVA) 80% hydrolyzed (Sigma, cat. no. 360627)

192 • Ultrapure water (see REAGENT SETUP)

193 • Ethanol 70% (vol/vol)

194 • 0.9% (wt/vol) NaCl (see REAGENT SETUP)

195 • Standard C3 control beads (AES-Chemunex, cat. no. 200-R5070-01)

196 **CRITICAL** Protect this solution from light.

197 • Counterstaining reagent CSE/2 (AES-Chemunex, cat. no. 200-R4091-01) (see
198 REAGENT SETUP)

199 **CRITICAL** Protect this solution from light as counterstaining properties may
200 be lost upon exposure to light.

201 • ChemSol A4 (AES-Chemunex, cat. no. 200-R2050-01) (see REAGENT
202 SETUP)

203 • ChemSol A6 (AES-Chemunex, cat. no. 200-R2053-01) (see REAGENT
204 SETUP)

205 • ChemSol B2 (AES-Chemunex, cat. no. 200-R2022-02) (see REAGENT
206 SETUP)

207 • ChemSol B16 (AES-Chemunex, cat. no. 200-R2023-02) (see REAGENT
208 SETUP)

209 • ChemChrome V6 (AES-Chemunex, cat. no. 200-R1007-03) (see REAGENT
210 SETUP)

211 **CRITICAL** Protect this solution from light.

212

213 **EQUIPMENT**

- 214 • MAS-100 Eco impaction air sampler (Merck) (see EQUIPMENT SETUP)
- 215 • Petri dish, 90 mm diameter
- 216 • Petri dish, 55 mm diameter
- 217 • Magnetic stirring plate
- 218 • Laminar flow cabinet, biohazard type II (= downward laminar flow with
- 219 exhaust air passing through a HEPA filter. A class II safety cabinet therefore
- 220 provides protection for the technician, environment and experiment.)
- 221 • 0.22 µm pore size filter/storage bottle system (Corning Inc., cat. no. 430767)
- 222 • Vortex mixer
- 223 • Tweezers
- 224 • 0.4 µm Cycloblack-coated polyester membrane filter, 25 mm diameter (AES-
- 225 Chemunex, cat. no. 200-C2010-01)
- 226 • 2.0 µm Cycloblack-coated polyester membrane filter, 25 mm diameter (AES-
- 227 Chemunex, cat. no. 200-C2011-01)
- 228 • Filtration unit with 3 ports with sintered glass filter supports and vacuum
- 229 release valves
- 230 • Vacuum pump capable of sustaining 400 millibars
- 231 • Sterile syringes with needles
- 232 • 0.2 µm pore size cellulose acetate syringe filter (Whatman Schleicher and
- 233 Schuell, cat. no. 10 462 200)
- 234 • Labelling pad (AES-Chemunex, cat. no. 200-C3012-02)
- 235 • Incubator at 30 °C
- 236 • Incubator at 37 °C
- 237 • Support pad (AES-Chemunex, cat. no. 200-C2107-01)
- 238 • Refrigerator 4 °C

- 239 • Filter holder (AES-Chemunex, supplied with the ChemScan RDI)
- 240 • ChemScan RDI (AES-Chemunex) (see EQUIPMENT SETUP)
- 241 • PC equipped with the ChemScan user interface (AES-Chemunex) (see
- 242 EQUIPMENT SETUP)
- 243 • Epifluorescence microscope (e.g. Olympus BX40) equipped with a compatible
- 244 computer-driven moving stage (e.g. Olympus) (see EQUIPMENT SETUP)

245

246 REAGENT SETUP

247 **0.9% NaCl** Sterilize by filtration through a 0.22 µm filter/storage bottle system. This
248 solution can be stored for one month at 4 °C.

249

250 **Labeling reagents** Filter the counterstaining reagent, ChemSol A4, A6, B2 and B16
251 and ultrapure water through a 0.22 µm pore size cellulose acetate syringe filter. These
252 solutions should be prepared fresh each day and stored at 4 °C between experiments.

253

254 EQUIPMENT SETUP

255 **MAS-100 Eco** This impaction air sampler has a constant airflow of 100 l min⁻¹.
256 Samples of 10–1,000 l of air can be collected (collection times ranging between 6 s
257 and 10 min). In the MAS-100 *Eco*, air is drawn through a perforated lid and particles
258 present in the air are impacted onto a solid material.

259

260 **ChemScan RDI** This solid phase cytometer is equipped with a laser for excitation at
261 488 nm and two photomultiplier tubes with wavelength windows set for the green
262 (500–530 nm) and amber (540–585 nm) regions of the fluorescein emission spectrum.

263

Fluorescence microscope The Olympus BX40 is equipped with a moving stage directed by a computer via the Chemscan user interface. Components of the microscope include a $\times 40/0.75$ and $\times 10/0.25$ objective, a 10/22 eyepiece, a 100 W mercury lamp and a filter block containing a filter cube consisting of a 500 nm dichroic mirror, a 450–490 nm bandpass excitation and a 515 nm cut-off emission filter (Olympus, type UMWD).

271 **PROCEDURE**

272 **Air sampling**

273 **TIMING 1 - 10 min**

274 **1** Wipe the perforated lid and dust cover of the air sampler with 70% ethanol
275 (vol/vol) before and between sampling cycles.

276 **CRITICAL STEP** Make sure that the holes in the perforated lid are not clogged by
277 controlling if all ethanol is evaporated before continuing to the next step.

278

279 **2** Collect air samples (10–1,000 l) in triplicate on PVA plates using the MAS-100
280 Eco.

281 **CRITICAL STEP** In order to minimize the effect of desiccation of the
282 microorganisms during air sampling, the sampling volume should be kept to a
283 minimum after initial determination of the bioaerosol concentration.

284 **TROUBLESHOOTING**

285 **PAUSE POINT** The PVA plates are sealed with parafilm and transported to the lab.
286 A period of 4 hours between sample collection and sample preparation does not lead
287 to a reduction in the number of microorganisms. The effect of a longer period
288 between sampling and dissolution of the PVA plate has not been investigated.

289

290 **Preparation of the samples**

291 **TIMING 16 min**

292 (all steps need to be performed under sterile conditions in the laminar flow cabinet)

293

294 **3** Remove the polymer from the Petri dish using sterile tweezers.

295 **CRITICAL STEP** Do not flame the tweezers but use ethanol (70% vol/vol) to
296 sterilize them.

297

298 **4** Transfer the film to a sterile sample pot and add 20 ml of physiological saline to
299 ensure maximum recovery of the microorganisms.

300 **CRITICAL STEP** Close but do not shake the recipient and allow the polymer film to
301 dissolve for 15 min.

302 **PAUSE POINT** Polymer suspensions (sealed with parafilm) can be stored for 5 h at 4
303 °C.

304

305 **Filtration and labelling**

306 (all steps need to be performed under sterile conditions in the laminar flow cabinet)

307

308 **5** Determine the TVC (A) or the fungal count (B) as follows:

309 **(A) Total viable count**

310 **TIMING 3 h 30 min**

311 (i) Successively wash the filter support 3 times with 70% ethanol and 3 times
312 with filtered (0.22 µm) ultrapure water.

313

314 (ii) Place a 0.4 µm Cycloblack-coated polyester membrane filter in the center
315 of the filter support using sterile tweezers.

316

317 (iii) Switch on the vacuum pump and filter a measured volume of the
318 suspension over the membrane.

319 **CRITICAL STEP** Homogenize the suspension by inverting it. Do not use
320 the vortex mixer as the solution will foam excessively.

321 **CRITICAL STEP** Depending on the expected bioaerosol concentration,
322 different volumes of the PVA suspension need to be filtered. Preliminary
323 tests may indicate whether filtration of larger volumes is necessary, or in
324 contrast, dilution of the suspension before filtration is necessary.

325 **CRITICAL STEP** Distribute the sample over the entire surface of the
326 filter in order to obtain a maximal spread of the microorganisms and hence
327 make validation easier.

328 **CRITICAL STEP** As soon as the sample has been filtered, switch the
329 vacuum pump off.

330

331 (iv) Counterstain interfering particles by filtering 1 ml of CSE/2.

332 **CRITICAL STEP** Protect this solution from light.

333

334 (v) Place a labelling pad with 600 µl of ChemSol A4 pipetted onto it in a 55
335 mm Petri dish. Transfer the filter to the labelling pad and incubate at 37 °C
336 for 3 h.

337 **CRITICAL STEP** Before incubation, put a labelling pad soaked with 600
338 µl physiological saline in the lid of the Petri dish to create a humid
339 atmosphere.

340

341 (vi) After vortexing, dilute ChemChrome V6 1:100 in ChemSol B16.

342 **CRITICAL STEP** This solution can be stored for 5 h at 4 °C, but needs to
343 be protected from light.

344

345 (vii) Incubate the filter for 30 min at 30 °C on a labelling pad with 600 µl
346 ChemChrome V6 solution pipetted onto it.

347 **PAUSE POINT** After incubation, filters can be stored at 4 °C on the
348 ChemChrome V6 solution for 12 h.

349

350 **(B) Fungal count**

351 **TIMING 4 h**

352 (i) Successively wash the filter support 3 times with 70% ethanol and 3 times
353 with filtered ultrapure water.

354

355 (ii) Place a 2.0 µm Cycloblack-coated polyester membrane filter in the center
356 of the filter support using sterile tweezers.

357

358 (iii) Switch on the vacuum pump and filter a measured volume of the
359 suspension over the membrane.

360 **CRITICAL STEP** Homogenize the suspension by inverting it. Do not use
361 the vortex mixer as the solution will foam excessively.

362 **CRITICAL STEP** Depending on the expected bioaerosol concentration,
363 different volumes of the PVA suspension need to be filtered. Preliminary
364 tests may indicate whether filtration of larger volumes is necessary, or in
365 contrast, dilution of the suspension before filtration is necessary.

366 **CRITICAL STEP** Distribute the sample over the entire surface of the
367 filter in order to obtain a maximal spread of the microorganisms and hence
368 make validation easier.

369 **CRITICAL STEP** As soon as the sample has been filtered, switch the
370 vacuum pump off.

371

372 (iv) Place a labelling pad with 600 µl of ChemSol A6 pipetted onto it in a 55
373 mm Petri dish. Transfer the filter to the labelling pad and incubate at 37 °C
374 for 3 h.

375 **CRITICAL STEP** Before incubation, put a labelling pad soaked with 600
376 µl physiological saline in the lid of the Petri dish in order to create a humid
377 atmosphere.

378

379 (v) After vortexing, dilute ChemChrome V6 1:100 in ChemSol B2.

380 **CRITICAL STEP** This solution can be stored for 5 h at 4 °C but needs to
381 be protected from light.

382

383 (vi) Incubate the filter for 1 h at 37 °C on a labelling pad with 600 µl
384 ChemChrome V6 solution pipetted onto it.

385 **PAUSE POINT** After incubation, filters can be stored at 4 °C on the
386 ChemChrome V6 solution for 12 h.

387

388 **Laser scanning**

389 **TIMING 6 min**

390 **6** Place 100 µl of ChemSol B16 or ChemSol B2 onto the membrane holder to
391 determine the TVC or the fungal count, respectively.

392

7 Place a support pad on the membrane holder and wait until the pad has absorbed the ChemSol B16 or ChemSol B2 completely.

8 Transfer the labelled membrane from the labelling pad to the support pad.

CRITICAL STEP Make sure that no bubbles are trapped under the membrane.

9 Initiate a scan using the 'tvc' or 'fungi' application, respectively (see **Table 1**).

10 Depending of the number of fluorescent spots, next proceed to microscopic validation (A) or reanalysis (B). If the scan is aborted because too many fluorescent spots were detected by the laser or if the validation would be too cumbersome because of the high number of fluorescent spots in the secondary window, continue with a reanalysis of the samples. Otherwise complete the analysis with the microscopic validation of each fluorescent spot in the secondary window. This window displays the fluorescent spots which are retained after software discrimination by the computer (see Experimental design).

TROUBLESHOOTING

(A) Microscopic validation

TIMING 6 min

- (i) Remove the filter holder from the ChemScan RDI and place it on the moving stage of the epifluorescence microscope in exactly the same orientation.

- (ii) Validate all spots in the secondary window based on fluorescence intensity, characteristic shape and line amplitudes. Discriminate between bacteria, fungi and fluorescent particles (see **Fig. 4**).

TROUBLESHOOTING

(B) Reanalysis

TIMING 4 h 12 min

- (i) Repeat the protocol starting from step 5 and filter the volume necessary to obtain a lower number of fluorescent spots in the secondary window.

CRITICAL STEP As polymer solutions can only be stored for 5 h, reanalysis is only possible if no delays were encountered during the protocol.

Data analysis

TIMING 1 min

11 Calculate the number of microorganisms per square meter based on the results from the TVC count using the following formula:

$$\begin{aligned} &\text{Number of microorganisms/m}^3 \\ &= \\ &\frac{(\text{number of validated microorganisms} \times 20,000)}{(\text{filtered volume in ml}) \times (\text{sampled air volume in l})} \end{aligned}$$

CRITICAL STEP Do not use the positive hole conversion table supplied with the air sampler as this is only valid for impaction on culture media.

12 Calculate the number of fungi per square meter based on the results from the fungal count using the following formula:

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \text{Number of fungi per m}^3 \\
 & = \\
 & \frac{(\text{number of validated fungi} \times 20,000)}{(\text{filtered volume in ml}) \times (\text{sampled air volume in l})}
 \end{aligned}$$

13 Calculate the number of bacteria per square meter based on the previous results using the following formula:

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \text{Number of bacteria per m}^3 \\
 & = \\
 & \text{number of microorganisms per m}^3 - \text{number of fungi per m}^3
 \end{aligned}$$

453 **TIMING**

454 A summary of the approximate time necessary to complete the various stages of the
455 SPC procedure is presented in **Figure 3**.

456

457 **TROUBLESHOOTING**

458 Troubleshooting advice can be found in **Table 2**.

459

ANTICIPATED RESULTS

After labelling with ChemChrome V6, intensely labelled, green fluorescent microorganisms can be observed using the epifluorescence microscope. Typical microscopy images seen during validation are shown in **Figure 4**. Validation is easy to perform as bacteria and fungi can clearly be discriminated in fluorescence images based on their characteristic shape. Additionally, typically less than ten particles are retained in the secondary window after counterstaining with CSE/2 or filtering through a 2.0 μm membrane filter. Fungal counts obtained with the TVC protocol and the fungi protocol are comparable. Consequently, the use of the fungi protocol can be avoided and counts for both bacteria and fungi can be obtained using one protocol, making analysis even less complicated and expensive.

In **Figure 5** the average log number of bacterial and fungal cells is shown for air samples collected in triplicate at ten various locations. Initially, we collected 100-l air samples at these locations and filtered 9 ml of the polymer solution to obtain a TVC count and fungal count. Depending on the number of airborne bacteria and fungi, we reanalyzed (different filtered volume) and/or resampled (different sampled air volume), leading to an accurate, quantitative result for all samples (**Fig. 5**). Bacterial counts ranged from 185 to 930,000 cells/ m^3 whereas fungal counts were usually lower, ranging from 30 to 12,000 for the locations shown in **Figure 5**. The low detection limit of one cell per filter and hence per filtered volume makes the SPC method particularly suited for accurate analysis of air samples containing low numbers of microorganisms. Additionally, the possibility to dilute the polymer suspension also enables the analysis of high microbial load samples. Comparison of the standard errors of the mean obtained for triplicate analysis of samples obtained at 50 locations with the SPC method and a traditional culture-based method revealed

485 that although the SPC method requires more manipulation the variation of the results
486 is similar (Kolmogorov-Smirnov test).

487 **ACKNOWLEDGMENTS**

488 We acknowledge the excellent technical assistance of M. Battista. This research was
489 financially supported by the Bijzonder Onderzoeksfonds of Ghent University (project
490 B/07601/02).

491

492 **COMPETING INTERESTS STATEMENTS**

493 The authors declare no competing financial interests.

REFERENCES

1. Lisle, J. T., Hamilton, M. A., Willse, A. R. & McFeters, G. A. Comparison of fluorescence microscopy and solid-phase cytometry methods for counting bacteria in water. *Appl. Environ. Microbiol.* **70**, 5343-6348 (2004).
2. Mignon-Godefroy, K., Guillet, J.-G. & Butor, C. Solid phase cytometry for detection of rare events. *Cytometry* **27**, 336-344 (1997).
3. Joux, F. & Lebaron, P. Use of fluorescent probes to assess physiological functions of bacteria at single-cell level. *Microbes Infect.* **2**, 1523-1535 (2000).
4. Broadaway, S. C., Barton, S. A. & Pyle, B. H. Rapid staining and enumeration of small numbers of total bacteria in water by solid-phase laser cytometry. *Appl. Environ. Microbiol.* **69**, 4272-4273 (2003).
5. Parthuisot, N., Catala, P., Lemarchand, K., Baudart, J. & Lebaron, P. Evaluation of Chemchrome V6 for bacterial viability assessment in waters. *J. Appl. Microbiol.* **89**, 370-380 (2000).
6. Reynolds, D. T. & Fricker, C. R. Application of laser scanning for the rapid and automated detection of bacteria in water samples. *J. Appl. Microbiol.* **86**, 785-795 (1999).

7. De Vos, M. M. & Nelis, H. J. An improved method for the selective detection of fungi in hospital waters by solid phase cytometry. *J. Microbiol. Meth.* **67**, 557-565 (2006).
8. Van Poucke, S. O. & Nelis, H. J. A 210-min solid phase cytometry test for the enumeration of *Escherichia coli* in drinking water. *J. Appl. Microbiol.* **89**, 390-396 (2000).
9. Pyle, B. H., Broadaway, S. C. & McFeters, G. A. Sensitive detection of *Escherichia coli* O157:H7 in food and water by immunomagnetic separation and solid-phase laser cytometry. *Appl. Environ. Microbiol.* **65**, 1966-1972 (1999).
10. de Roubin, M.-R. et al. Application of laser scanning cytometry followed by epifluorescent and differential interference contrast microscopy for the detection and enumeration of *Cryptosporidium* and *Giardia* in raw and potable waters. *J. Appl. Microbiol.* **93**, 599-607 (2002).
11. Rushton, P., Place, B. M. & Lightfoot, N. F. An evaluation of a laser scanning device for the detection of *Cryptosporidium parvum* in treated water samples. *Lett. Appl. Microbiol.* **30**, 303-307 (2000).
12. Aurell, H. et al. Rapid detection and enumeration of *Legionella pneumophila* in hot water systems by solid-phase cytometry. *Appl. Environ. Microbiol.* **70**, 1651-1657 (2004).

- 542 13. Pournard, C. et al. Rapid detection and enumeration of *Naegleria fowleri* in
543 surface waters by solid-phase cytometry. *Appl. Environ. Microbiol.* **68**, 3102-3107
544 (2002).
- 545
- 546 14. West, N. J. et al. Rapid quantification of the toxic alga *Prymnesium parvum* in
547 natural samples by use of a specific monoclonal antibody and solid-phase cytometry.
548 *Appl. Environ. Microbiol.* **72**, 860-868 (2006).
- 549
- 550 15. Baudart, J., Olaizola, A., Coallier, J., Gauthier, V. & Laurent, P. Assessment of a
551 new technique combining a viability test, whole-cell hybridization and laser-scanning
552 cytometry for the direct counting of viable *Enterobacteriaceae* cells in drinking water.
553 *FEMS Microbiol. Lett.* **243**, 405-409 (2005).
- 554
- 555 16. Lepeuple, S., Delabre, K., Giloupe, S., Intertaglia, L. & de Roubin, M. R. Laser
556 scanning detection of FISH-labelled *Escherichia coli* from water samples. *Water Sci.*
557 *Technol.* **47**, 123-129 (2003).
- 558
- 559 17. Töbe, K., Eller, G. & Medlin, L. K. Automated detection and enumeration for
560 toxic algae by solid-phase cytometry and the introduction of a new probe for
561 *Prymnesium parvum* (Haptophyta: *Prymnesiophyceae*). *J. Plankt. Res.* **28**, 643-657
562 (2006).
- 563
- 564 18. Cools, I., D'Haese, E., Uyttendaele, M., Storms, E., Nelis H. J. & Debevere, J.
565 Solid phase cytometry as a tool to detect viable but non-culturable cells of
566 *Campylobacter jejuni*. *J. Microbiol. Meth.* **63**, 107-114 (2005).

567

568 19. Vanhee, L. M. E., Nelis, H. J. & Coenye, T. Enumeration of airborne bacteria and
569 fungi using solid phase cytometry. *J. Microbiol. Meth.* **72**, 12-19 (2008).

570

571 20. De Vos, M. M. & Nelis, H. J. Detection of *Aspergillus fumigatus* hyphae by solid
572 phase cytometry. *J. Microbiol. Meth.* **55**, 557-564 (2003).

573

574 21. De Vos, M. M., Sanders, N. N. & Nelis, H. J. Detection of *Aspergillus fumigatus*
575 hyphae in respiratory secretions by membrane filtration, fluorescent labelling and
576 laser scanning. *J. Microbiol. Meth.* **64**, 420-423 (2006).

577

578 22. Bauters, T. G. M., Swinne, D., Stove, V. & Nelis H. J. Detection of single cells of
579 *Cryptococcus neoformans* in clinical samples by solid-phase cytometry. *J. Clin.*
580 *Microbiol.* **41**, 1736-1737 (2003).

581

582 23. Catala, P. et al. Effectiveness of CSE to counterstain particles and dead bacterial
583 cells with permeabilised membranes: application to viability assessment in waters.
584 *FEMS Microbiol. Lett.* **178**, 219-226 (1999).

585

586 24. Cruz, P. & Buttner, M.P. Analysis of bioaerosol samples. In *Manual of*
587 *Environmental Microbiology* Edn. 3 (eds. Hurst, C.J. et al.) 68.952-68.960 (ASM
588 Press, Washington D.C., USA, 2007).

589

25. Lemarchand, K., Parthuisot, N., Catala, P. & Lebaron P. Comparative assessment of epifluorescence microscopy, flow cytometry and solid-phase cytometry used in the enumeration of specific bacteria in water. *Aquat. Microbial Ecol.* **25**, 301-309 (2001).
26. Prigione, V., Lingua, G. & Filipello Marchisio, V. Development and use of flow cytometry for detection of airborne fungi. *Appl. Environ. Microbiol.* **70**, 1360-1365 (2004).
27. Alvarez, A.J., Buttner, M.P. & Stetzenbach, L.D. PCR for bioaerosol monitoring: sensitivity and environmental interference. *Appl. Environ. Microbiol.* **61**, 3639-3644 (1995).
28. Giovannangelo, M.E.C.A. et al. Levels and determinants of β (1 \rightarrow 3)-glucans and fungal extracellular polysaccharides in house dust of (pre-)schoolchildren in three European countries. *Environ. Internat.* **33**, 9-16 (2007).
29. Robine, E., Lacaze, I., Moularat, S., Ritoux, S. & Boissier, M. Characterisation of exposure to airborne fungi: measurement of ergosterol. *J. Microbiol. Meth.* **63**, 185-192 (2005).
30. Venkateswaran, K., Hattori, N., La Duc, M.T. & Kern, R. ATP as a biomarker of viable microorganisms in clean-room facilities. *J. Microbiol. Meth.* **52**, 367-377 (2003).

615 **Table 1** Summary of the software discriminants and their values used in the two scan
616 applications of the ChemScan RDI

Software discriminants	Scan application			
	TVC		Fungi	
	Minimum	Maximum	Minimum	Maximum
Lines	1	50	1	60
Samples	1	250	1	250
Area (color) ratio	0	1.1	0	1.2
Peak intensity value	250	NA	250	NA
Half width	NA	15	NA	15
Specific intensity (AS)	10	NA	3	N/A
Specific intensity (HW)	25	NA	20	NA
2D gaussian	NA	850	NA	1,800
Multi peaks	NA	1	NA	2
Multi wiggles	NA	3	NA	5

617 **Table 2** Troubleshooting table.

Step	Problem	Possible cause	Solution
EXP. DESIGN	The polymer film does not solidify	Incomplete dissolution of PVA before filtration	Slowly add the ultrapure water to the PVA powder. Make sure no gelatinous masses are formed. Make sure to leave the PVA solution on the magnetic stirring plate for 15 min.
2	'AIRBLOCK' appears on the display of the MAS-100 Eco	Impeded airflow because the perforated lid is blocked	Make sure no ethanol is left in the holes of the perforated lid. If a lot of particles are suspected in the sampled air, clean the perforated lid with compressed air between sampling cycles.
10	Scan aborted because too many fluorescent spots are detected by the laser	Too many microorganisms present in the sample	Reanalyze the sample by diluting it or filtering a smaller volume. Collect a smaller volume of air onto the PVA plates.
		Too many particles present in the sample	Make sure all reagents used in the protocol are filtered through a 0.22 µm

filter.

Make sure the tweezers used to manipulate the membrane filter are not flamed.

Make sure a counterstaining step is included in the TVC labelling protocol.

Check if the right application was used and if the discriminant settings were not altered.

Very low number of fluorescent spots in the secondary window	Air sample with low bioaerosol concentration	Sample a larger volume of air at this location.
	Vacuum pump switched on too long	Switch off the vacuum pump immediately after filtering.
No microorganisms visible during validation	Wrong offsets	Check with the reference membrane if the offsets are set correctly.
	Bleaching	Make sure the microorganisms are not extensively illuminated.

Figure 1 Schematic overview of solid phase cytometry. Steps include: membrane filtration, fluorescent labelling, scanning, data analysis by a computer and microscopic validation. After scanning of the filter all fluorescent spots are displayed in a primary scan map image. Data obtained during a scan include size, fluorescence intensity, color ratio and signal pattern for each fluorescent spot. Based on these values, the computer differentiates between fluorescent particles and microorganisms and displays the latter in a secondary scan map. Finally, the filter is placed under an epifluorescence microscope in exactly the same orientation and each spot in the secondary window can be inspected.

Figure 2 Overview of the software parameters used by the computer to discriminate among microorganisms. The four main discriminants are size, specific intensity, color ratio and signal pattern of the detected fluorescent spot.

Figure 3 Flow diagram of the procedure. Time required for each step is indicated on the right side. Pause points are indicated by red arrows and specific information about length and conditions of storage is shown.

Figure 4 Anticipated results. (a–d) Microscope images of *Pseudomonas aeruginosa* (a), *Candida albicans* (b), *Aspergillus fumigatus* (c) and an autofluorescent particle (d) viewed during validation. Scale bars represent 7 μm .

Figure 5 Anticipated results. The average log number of bacterial and fungal cells per m^3 ($n = 3$) for air samples collected at ten various locations. For each location, the sampled air volume and filtered volume used to obtain the quantitative results are indicated in the table below the figure. Error bars represent standard error of the mean.